

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the above-identified application, and were rejected. With this Amendment, no claims were amended, added or cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claims 1-4 and 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Uomori (U.S. Patent No. 5,726,704 A) and Sundahl et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,215 A). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a stereoscopic-image generating method comprising determining a position of an object in a first image, determining a position of the object in a second image, wherein the first image is picked up with a pickup apparatus in a predetermined first state and the second image is picked up with the pickup apparatus in a second state different from the first state, and moving one of the first image or the second image so that the object in the first image coincides with the object in the second image.

Uomori discloses a stereoscopic image pickup and display apparatus. Fig. 1 shows the stereoscopic image pickup and display apparatus according to Uomori. In Fig. 1, the numerals 1 and 2 are lenses, 3a and 3b are camera bodies, 4a and 4b are rotation controllers, and 5 is the camera spacing controller. (See Col. 5, lines 38-41). The numerals 14a and 14b are signal processors each for converting the camera, 4a and 4b, signal into the luminance signal, 15 is a parallax calculator. (See Col. 5, lines 42-44). The apparatus calculates an average value for the parallax over an entire screen or a weighted average value with greater weight at the center of the

screen. (See col. 13, lines 61-64). The apparatus shifts one of the images by the average value of the binocular parallax in a direction that cancels the parallax. (See col. 14, lines 27-28). As the Examiner has stated, Uomori neither discloses nor suggests moving one of the first image or the second image so that the object in the first image coincides with the object in the second image, as required by claim 1. Thus, it would not be obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a single image pickup apparatus as taught by Sundahl, in place of the two cameras taught throughout Uomori to derive claim 1, or claims 2-4 that depend from claim 1. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, and claims 10-15 that depend from claim 9 are also allowable over Uomori in view of Sundahl. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Uomori (U.S. Patent No. 5,726,704 A) and Pritchard et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,157,484 A). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Uomori neither discloses nor suggests moving one of the first image or the second image so that the object in the first image coincides with the object in the second image, as required by claim 1. Thus, it would not be obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a single image pickup apparatus as taught by Pritchard, in place of the two cameras of Uomori to derive claim 1, or claims 5 and 6 that depend from claim 1. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, and claims 16 and 17 that depend from claim 9 are

also allowable over Uomori in view of Pritchard. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Uomori (U.S. Patent No. 5,726,704 A) and Lia (U.S. Patent No. 5,222,477 A). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As discussed above, Uomori neither discloses nor suggests moving one of the first image or the second image so that the object in the first image coincides with the object in the second image, as required by claim 1. Thus, it would not be obvious at the time the invention was made to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a single image pickup apparatus as taught by Lia, in place of the two cameras of Uomori to derive claim 1, or claims 7 and 8 that depend from claim 1. For reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, and claims 18 and 19 that depend from claim 9 are also allowable over Uomori in view of Lia. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully request early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 27, 2005

By: 

David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000